October 20, 1981

Finland v. the USA: Imprisonment Responses to Crime

Roger V. Endell

Suggested citation

Endell, Roger V. (1981). "Finland v. the USA: Imprisonment Responses to Crime." Manuscript submitted as chapter for John P.J. Dussich (ed.), *Creative Punishment: The Scandinavian Experiences in Perspective*.

Summary

This manuscript, prepared as a chapter for a prospective book on corrections and punishment in the Scandinavian/Nordic nations of northern Europe, compares Finland with the United States with respect to the imprisonment response to crime, correctional policies, and correctional populations.

Additional information

This manuscript was submitted as a chapter for the book *Creative Punishment: The Scandinavian Experiences in Perspective* edited by John P. J. Dussich. The Justice Center has not been able to locate publication information for this book, or to verify that it was in fact published.

FINLAND AND THE USA:

IMPRISONMENT RESPONSES TO CRIME

by

ROGER V. ENDELL

JUSTICE CENTER

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

Submitted as Chapter 2
for the book:
CREATIVE PUNISHMENT:
THE SCANDINAVIAN EXPERIENCES
IN PERSPECTIVE
John P.J. Dussich, Editor

March 15, 1981
Revised April 15, 1981
Final Revision October 20, 1981

Inkeri Anttila, the director of the Finnish Research Institute of Legal Policy and a member of the Scandinavian Research Council for Criminology, describes Finland in relationship to the other northern European countries.

> Culturally Finland is clearly a part of Scandinavia. All of Scandinavia shares a common legal heritage, and therefore Finland's crime control policy corresponds in many respects to that followed by her Scandinavian neighbors. This similarity is strengthened by long and intensive Scandinavian cooperation. (Anttila, 1979:103)

But, there are differences. Being somewhat removed from the principle transportation and communication corridors existing in modern day Europe, Finland's achievements in penal philosophy and policy may have been given lesser recognition than its Scandinavian neighbors to the west. This circumstance does not negate Finnish influence on the penal systems and policies of other western European nations, however, especially those of Norway, Denmark and Sweden. While the latter two have seemed to have received more attention, at least from American practitioners and scholars, it appears likely that the Finnish prison system is highly regarded by the other Scandinavian countries. Does Finland have something to offer to interested Americans or to others beyond the region of northern Europe? The answer must be in the affirmative.

As the easternmost nation of that part of northern

Europe commonly known as Scandinavia, Finland provides a stimulating example of the evolutionary nature of change in social-justice policy making. In order to appreciate Finland's accomplishments more fully, an observer should be cognizant of geographical and historical factors which have helped to define the evolutionary process. Substantive events acquire a richness of meaning when consideration is also given to these temporal and spatial interrelationships. Finland's ties to its closest neighbors to the east and west were once imposed rather than elective.

Historical and Geographic Factors

From 1155 to 1809 Finland formed a part of the kingdom of Sweden. Connected from 1809 with Russia, Finland was an autonomous Grand Duchy with the Czar of Russia as Grand Duke of Finland until December 6, 1917, the date of Finland's declaration of independence. The republican constitution was adopted in 1919, and the legislative power of the country vested in Parliament and the President. The President is elected for a period of six years. In fact, Dr. Urho Kekkonen has been President continuously since 1956. The 200 members of Parliament are elected by way of "universal suffrage" to four year terms of office.

Finland encompasses approximately 130,165 square miles of land and lakes within its borders. By contrast, Finland

falls between Sweden and Norway in size with Denmark being the much smaller of the four major nations. Iceland is smaller still. Finnish land is distributed among various owners including private (60.7%), state (29.4%), joint stock companies, etc. (8.0%), and municipalities and parishes (1.9%). In 1975 Finland's population numbered some 4.7 million people, smaller than both Sweden and Denmark but larger than Norway (see Table 1), with 41% of the population inhabiting the rural areas and 59% located in towns and urban districts.

Table 1

Land Area and Population (1975) Comparisons, Scandinavia

Country	Land Area (Square miles)	Population (Millions)
Finland	130,165	4.7
Sweden	173,620	8.2
Norway	125,064	4.0
Denmark	16,615	5.1

(Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1977:59)

Finland's capital, Helsinki, located at approximately the same latitude as Leningrad (USSR), Bergen (Norway), and Anchorage (Alaska, USA), has a population of one half million people. Agriculture and forestry employ 15% of the population of Finland, industry and construction 36%, commercial business 16%, transport and communications 7%, and

service industries 26%. The population is overwhelmingly Finnish speaking (93.3%) although 6.5% of native Finns are Swedish speaking. Less than 0.2% speak other languages. The nation has nearly a 100% literacy rate for all persons over the age of 15. Its educational system includes six major universities (the oldest founded in 1640) and twelve colleges of similar and high standards (Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1977:59).

Centuries of Swedish domination and decades of Russian rule have not dampened the cultural independence of the Finnish people. Since World War II especially, the Finns have experienced accelerated industrialization and modernization and with these developments a movement from rural to urban based economies. At the same time that attention has been focused upon economic development in Finland, recognition must be given to the contributions of individuals. Finnish composers, artists, poets, athletes and statesmen have impressed and influenced the people of the world with their talents. The Finnish term, sisu, refers to a stubborn, strong-willed, and don't-give-up attitude that perhaps exemplifies the independent nature of this determined people. It is currently noteworthy that the Helsinki Accords have had such a remarkable influence in recent international relationships.

Land Area and Population Comparisons

In "The Role of Imprisonment in Finland," Joutsen has provided a succinct and authoritative overview of Finland's

penal policies and practices. The hurried reader risks missing many of the finer points. Within the Joutsen chapter there are indications of similarities and both subtle and major differences from American penal philosophy and practice.

Knut Sveri, Chair of the Scandinavian Research Council for Criminology, has stated that in spite of international interest in Scandinavian practices, the Scandinavians themselves have not been satisfied with their various past crime policies. He argues that in all of the Scandinavian countries (but perhaps most accentuated in Finland and Sweden) there have been two main questions under recent discussion. The first question has focused on "what type of behavior ought to be criminalized in a democratic, prosperous and highly industrialized country?" and the second, "what types of criminal sanctions are effective in our societies?" (Sveri, 1975:1,2)

While the former question implies that dangerousness must somehow be assessed, Sveri maintains that criminal sentencing should only be applied to those acts which are considered truly dangerous to the society and its individual members. Political agreement is possible on the avoidance of "over-criminalization" but it is also necessary to change the priorities of the remaining criminal statutes, he believes.

For the latter question, Sveri refers to the research literature which he feels clearly indicates that a treatment-oriented system of sanctions has been ineffective. He concludes that prison treatment programs should not be the

reason utilized to imprison, and in fact, he finds a defined need for re-examining the very political and philosophical reasons for using punishment at all.

How is it that such provocative questions can be asked, answers can be actively pursued, and policies and laws changed to reflect dissatisfaction with tradition and past practices? Could the United States or other nations follow such a methodological procedure of inquiry? More importantly, could the very same questions be asked so that discussion might follow that would eventually lead to policy and law changes?

Joutsen identifies the relative nature of size as an important ingredient in the chemistry of social-justice policy making. Where small groups of experts are responsible and accountable for policy formulation and implementation, change can more easily be monitored. But size might be accounted for in several ways. If, for example, Finland's land area were compared with the land area of individual states in the United States it would rank slightly larger than the state of New Mexico, and smaller than the state of Montana. In population comparisons, Finland would fall between the states of Wisconsin and Missouri. Table 2 indicates the relative differences by size of land areas and by populations for comparative purposes.

Table 2

Land Area and Population Comparisons
Finland (1977) and Selected States (1975)

Comparison by (1) Land Area and (2) Population

Location	Square Miles	Land Area Rank Among US States	Population (Millions)	Population Rank Among US States
New Mexico	121,666	5	1.1	37
Finland	130,165		4.7	
Montana	147,138	4	.735	43

Comparison by (1) Population and (2) Land Area

Location	Population (Millions)	Population Rank Among US States	Square Miles	Land Area Rank Among US States
Wisconsin	4.6	16	56,154	26
Finland	4.7		130,165	
Missouri	4.8	15	69,686	19

(Grosvenor, 1975; Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1977)

These comparisons are useful only in that they help to illustrate the difficulty of international comparisons based on only the two factors of land area and population. Numerous other potential socioeconomic, cultural, and environmental indicators might also be worthy of consideration.*

If one were to assume, however, that comparisons could logically be made in relationship to Sveri's first question--that is, that each of these areas is democratic, prosperous,

*Minority groups within the majority population might be considered. In Finland, other than the native Finns and a large Swedish population, there are two other substantial cultural groups consisting of the Lapps in the northern latitudes, and Gypsies who travel constantly and widely throughout the nation. The Lapps are apparently quite law abiding, except for relatively minor problems which occur and are related to the abuse of alcohol. The Gypsies, however, appear to provide a source of law breaking clientele related to their poor economic status, their migratory habits, and their penchant for gambling and other schemes involving deception.

and industrialized--then it may be legitimate to make at least general comparisons. In this case, population may become the more relevant factor.

Imprisonment Comparisons

Crime too, may be utilized as an index of the social character of different political entities for the purpose of at least general comparison. Although, As Tornudd (1975: 36-47) has pointed out, international comparisons of crime measures are replete with enormous difficulties. The problems of statistical comparison for the purpose of analyzing crime, or crime policy, include differing definitions of offenses, differing interpretations of law, differing enforcement activities, and differing counting and tabulating techniques to name but a few areas of difficulty. These problems, troublesome to control on an intranational basis, are compounded at the international level.

Nevertheless, socially or politically differentiated groups, whether they be at the state or national level, can be at least partially evaluated on the basis of some selected aspect of crime as one of many possible social indicators. The number of people imprisoned within a state or nation does indicate something about that area just as the literacy level or the level of health care might be informative. The number of incarcerated individuals per hundred thousand in the population of a given political subdivision (state or nation)

can be compared with other political subdivisions. While the results cannot be expected to inform as to whether one homogeneously identifiable area is more crime free or crime prone than another for reasons similar to those cited earlier, a comparison may still be of service by indicating at least general similarities and differences.

Table 3 indicates that if a general comparison of incarceration rates were made between Finland and several US states, Finland would outrank the American states of similar land area and those of similar population. It would be similar in incarceration rates to the states of Michigan, Alabama, Louisiana and Arizona for the same year (1975).

Table 3

Comparison of the Use of Imprisonment-1975

Comparison	Location	Incarceration Rate (per 100,000)
	Finland	121
States similar in land area	New Mexico	86
	Montana	50
States similar in population	Wisconsin	65
	Missouri	92
States similar in incarceration rates	Michigan	119
	Alabama	121
	Louisiana	126
	Arizona	118
	US Total Average	113

(Makinen, 1979; Flanangan et al, 1980)

There are similarities in incarceration rate trends as indicated by Makinen (1979:98) and Flanagan et al (1980:635). The former author indicates that the incarceration rates in Finland fell from a high of 149 per 100,000 in 1961 to a low of 99 per 100,000 in 1972 and then commenced to rise again

to the 121 per 100,000 level in 1975. A similar pattern has occurred in the American states appearing in Table 3 with the exception of the state of Alabama where a downturn in incarceration rates since 1975 is noted. This is undoubtedly due to the severely limiting Federal Court order imposed on the state of Alabama's prison system for its major deficiencies. Otherwise the trends in upward incarceration rates appear to be the same in Finland as they are in states of similar land area, population size, or general incarceration rates. All but the one under court order to decrease its prison population, are increasing! By the end of 1977 the United States' total average for incarcerations per 100,000 population had reached 129.

Factors in Imprisonment Policies

In a later paper Tornudd attempted to address the issue of how reactions occur in relation to fluctuating levels of crime--especially for the impact on policies of imprisonment. He argues:

> The fact that the prison system and the crime system as a whole has been able to handle the increasing number of prisoners can perhaps be interpreted as a kind of self-regulation within the system. When the crime rate goes up and up and the prison conditions threaten to become intolerable something has to give: e.g. the average severity of the sentences, the parole rules, or the legal definition of crime. Self-regulation processes involving some or all three of these mechanisms certainly can be identified in Finland during the time period studied here. (Tornudd, 1978:5)

He continues with the observation that there have also been independent changes in the "climate" of crime control policy including such factors as humanist concerns for the incarcerated offender, better criminological research, and growing doubts about the usefulness of long prison sentences. Tornudd reviews the slow recovery of the 1950s, the spread of affluence in the 1960s, and "the gradually more austere mood of the 1970's . . . brought about by the energy crisis of 1973 or by a need to react against some of the excesses of the 1960's." He concludes, that "the urbanization and industrialization process which Finland has undergone has, in a very general sense, increased the opportunities for crime and at the same time dissolved much of the established system for social control." Surely a similar observation might have been offered by another author about the American social-justice situation for the same period. Table 4 reflects the nature of change in Finnish society from 1950-1975 using several key indicators.

Americans too have been troubled by a fluctuating economy, social unrest, and the related turbulence of crime from the bottom to the top of the social and political structure. Public indignation over recent national and international traumas are now receiving the attention of

Table 4

A Changing Society: Some Key Indicators 1950-1975

	1950	1955	1960	1965	1970	1975
Total population, in millions	4.0	4.3	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.7
Province of Uusimaa: share of total population %	17	17	19	20	22	23
Urban communities: share of total population %	32	35	38	44	51	59
Males aged 15-24 in thousands	323	321	354	437	449	415
Percentual share of total population living in urban communities with a population of at least 30,000	20	21	24	30	34	37
Employment structure: man-years						
- agriculture and other primary production %	40		31	27	21	15
- manufacturing and other secondary production %	32		34	35	38	39
- services %	29		34	38	42	46
Gross domestic product per capita in 100 Fmks (1974 value)	60	75	89	108	137	161
Cars per 1000 inhabitants	7	20	41	98	155	211
Police personnel per 10,000 inhabitants	17	16	16	18	20	22
Alcohol consumption: 100 % alcohol litres per capita	1.7	2.0	1.8	2.4	4.5	6.2

(Tornudd, 1978:9)

American criminal justice scholars and practitioners as never before. The question of values in the system of justice is the basic issue central to an understanding of the working of the criminal justice system (Kittrie and Susman, 1979).

With prosperity has come conflict, frustration and a burgeoning prison population. The size of the prison population combined with the nation's jail population has received the attention of William Nagel of the American Foundation, Institute of Corrections.

> America, the world leader in telephones, automobiles, air conditioners, central heat, and bath tubs, has almost become the world leader in prisoners per hundred thousand of its people. Only the Soviet Union and South Africa surpass us and several of our states can claim the questionable distinction of exceeding even those two nations in their use of confinement. . . . (this nation's prison and jail population) would rank larger . . . than 21 of the U.N.'s present member nations.
>
> . Real or perceived, one result of the hysteria over crime, plus the increased efficiency of the police and prosecutors (aided by large doses of Law Enforcement Assistance Administration money) has been a state and federal prison population growth from 193,000 to 303,000 during this decade and the curve remains pointed upward. (Nagel, 1979:1,2).

Nagel has discussed previous findings with regard to the growth of America's prison population (1973, 1977) and cites more recent findings reported to the Congress of the United States (Rutherford et al, 1978). He emphasizes that within the sophisticated study for the Congress is the finding that the single most important contributor to prison population "was not crime, or unemployment, or family breakdowns, or race, or inflation. It was simply the availability

of cells. Judges, prosecutors, police, parole boards all adjust their practice to the availability of prison space." (Nagel, 1979:3)

The high costs of providing prison space have been cited repeatedly by numerous authors. Some argue that in the future the management of prisoners will be done in an increasingly economic fashion because of outside forces that act upon the system of imprisonment through application of various pressures. These pressures are identified as: 1) economic pressures which deal with availability and types of services in relation to population and budget; 2) public pressures which involve citizen demands for better crime control and the need for volunteers in the correctional system; 3) institutional pressures which deal with both the administration of institutions and the management of inmates; 4) offender pressures which involve the interest among offenders in inmate rights; and 5) court pressures which deal with decisions which affect the entire correctional system. (Clear and Clear, 1980:88)

Irwin discusses the search for a new ideology among public officials who shape prison policy--prison administrators, guards, legislators, judges, prosecutors--who are in a state of confusion. With the rehabilitative ideal having been thoroughly criticized, problems among the ranks of prison administrators, the increase in private interests and influence, and the further prisonization impact of the

determinate sentencing theory of justice, Irwin finds evidence for more problems than solutions:

> It appears certain that prison populations in the states with new sentencing laws will increase. The prison administrations will try to obtain allocations to build new, small, secure prisons. However, smaller prisons are more expensive per prisoner, and the public, as revealed by the property tax revolt, is not in the mood to spend huge sums for new prison construction. Rehabilitation programs will be reduced in number, because they are expensive and legislators are not going to spend money for something with such little support. (Irwin, 1980:227)

Murton speaks to the cyclical nature of prison reform efforts in the United States which follows a pattern of individual reform minded administrators and policy makers. He argues that the dilemma of prison reform efforts follows a critical pattern from conservative ideologies, to crisis, followed by liberal ideologies, the crisis, and a return to conservatism again (Murton, 1976).

It would appear then, that there is a pressing need in the United States for the identification of essential questions which could be formulated concerning the role of imprisonment. Unfortunately the historical record does not provide much support for optimism. Various task forces, commissions, advisory panels, and research efforts at the state and national levels have established standards and goals, plans and programs which have resulted in few successes in terms of reducing the use of imprisonment (Newman, 1980:57). Only where the courts have ordered some form of decarceration have fewer offenders been placed

behind prison or jail walls, and these cases have been based on constitutional grounds--primarily that of cruel and unusual punishment related to prison conditions. In any case there are more prisoners in America today than at any time in the nation's history (Gettinger, 1976 ; (Wilson, 1977 ; Johnson and Kravitz, 1978).

Impressions from a Visit

Joutsen cites the shift of the Finnish imprisonment policies over the 1960s and 1970s to a neoclassicist policy which would retain imprisonment but modify its traditional use. He finds that under this approach imprisonment should be replaced by other sanctions wherever possible, sentence length should be shortened, and imprisonment should be humanized. The figures cited by Joutsen indicate a heavy reliance upon fines as a preferred sanction. There is also an indication that the Penal Code Committee (appointed by the Council of State in 1972) worked diligently to decriminalize some offenses (public drunkenness had been decriminalized by an Act of Parliament passed in 1968), to rewrite the penal provisions for other offenses, and to develop greater use of alternative sanctions. But what of the calibre and quality of the open and closed institutions in Finland, their services or lack of them, and the general climate within the institution?

Zagaris has concluded that in Finland "there have been no significant reforms in closed prisons; most reform involves the increased useage of open institutions." He argues that although the Prison Administration had wished

to place half of all placements in institutions in open prisons, that the number of beds had not grown significantly in the last few years, primarily because of lack of resources. "The positive Finnish attitude toward open prison is, therefore, for the moment, more concept than reality" (Zagaris, 1977:32). But what of the existing institutions and their apparent quality? While measurement is difficult some qualitative impressions may be useful in describing the present system. This in turn may provide assistance in explaining Finland's imprisonment practices.

A Prison System Profile

Throughout Finland approximately 90 percent of the offender population is fined, while less than 10 percent is sentenced to incarceration as noted by Joutsen. The median length of all sentences of imprisonment in Finland in 1978 was 3.7 months. (One individual at the Helsinki Central Prison was serving an 18 year sentence, the longest sentence of all those incarcerated there.) Central and provincial prisons may hold several categories of offenders, i.e., pre-trial detainees, first offenders, and recidivists, predominantly the latter. The several central and provincial "closed" prisons in Finland hold between 400 and 600 prisoners in old but immaculate structures resembling the early American penitentiaries on a smaller scale.

All prisoners released on parole are placed under supervision. An offender may be granted "discretionary parole" after he has served two thirds or--for special reasons--one half of h sentence. However, in either case, he must have served at least

three months. Those sentenced to shorter periods are not eligible for parole. Ordinarily, according to Joutsen elsewhere, first time prisoners are released on parole after serving one-half of their sentence. An offender who has served five-sixths of his sentence, and at least six months, will be released on "mandatory parole" unless there are special reasons for denying it.

Vocational training opportunities are offered in all closed institutions in the form of various shops and training programs including, for example, those in furniture, printing, metal work and engine repair. The offender can earn a vocational certificate for training that is precisely the same as those programs offered to "civilians" outside the prison system. Educational, psychological, religious and work programs are available at all institutions. Work is mandatory by law for all prisoners in Finland and apparently most offenders prefer to work, although those few in pre-trial status are not required to do so.

An exception is granted to prisoners who choose to enroll in a course of studies (200 per year), for those who attend educational institutions outside of prison (100 per year), and for those who are permitted to work at their civilian occupation or equivalent (300), under work release. (Approximations are based on the Annual Reports of the Prison Administration.)

In 1972, and earlier, Finland had approximately 350 incarcerated women then in the prison system. The Hameenlinna Central and Provincial Prison, completed in 1972, was built for the purpose of housing 250 women. That facility now holds about 125

of the 160 female prisoners in the country, and approximately 90 spaces within the institution are set aside for, and used by, male offenders--a "co-correctional" setting in American terms. Except for those few women held at the Jarvenpaa women's labor colony, this facility now holds all of Finland's women prisoners. In Finland, female prisoners are permitted to keep their children with them until the child reaches the age of three. The women work at manufacturing and repairing institutional clothing and linens, kitchen work (cooking and waitress training and other related restaurant work can result in a certificate of vocational training) and maintenance of the facility.

The term "labor colony" as used in Finland is the equivalent to an "open" work farm or minimum security camp utilized in US correctional systems. The Jarvenpaa Women's Labor Colony, for example, houses thirteen women in space allocated for 30 in what was once a Finnish Army training camp in a small and informal rural setting. The high quality work products of these women from sewing, weaving and other crafts are sold on the open market.

The Suomenlinna Labor Colony provides another example of the open institution. Suomenlinna consists of a series of fortified islands in Helsinki's habor important in Finland's defense history. There are 100 male inmates at work restoring the historical buildings and facilities there, important to the tourist industry in the Helsinki area. Other labor colonies have been established in other locations around the nation for similar public works projects and for highway and runway (airport) construction or improvement projects.

All inmates in the open programs are paid union scale wages equivalent to that paid to "civilian" workers, a unique agreement between the unions and the Prison Administration which is rooted in the history of World War II when labor was in short supply. Open visitations are permitted with frequency, as are passes granted to qualifying inmates to visit spouses, close friends, and family members, to those housed in the labor colonies and on work release programs.

The visitor to Finland's open and closed prison institutions cannot help but be impressed by the clean, quiet, yet busy facilities where both staff and inmates exhibit good morale even in facilities that may be old and densely populated--very different at least from the majority of major American style prisons and work farms.

Criminal Welfare Association

The Criminal Welfare Association is equivalent to the US system of probation and parole administration but was until recently under private nationwide administration.

The organization is 110 years old and covers 12 regions of Finland through 11 halfway houses. Probation is a sentence primarily available to youths between 15 and 21 years of age. Forty-two hundred reports a year are processed by the Association with 1200 of these related to parole supervision following release from incarceration. The Association is staffed by social workers who go to the prisons prior to the inmates' release and assist them with locating jobs, lodging, etc. The Association previously managed active labor camps which were under its jurisdiction for parolees.

These have been reduced now to two, with 100 beds. Typical job placement for offenders includes work on highway and runway construction projects. As noted earlier, in Finland offenders working outside of prison environments work for the same wages as those paid to "civilians." The administrators of the Criminal Welfare Association felt that effective halfway houses should hold no more than ten to 16 beds.

In Helsinki there are three types of halfway houses. The first is a large (28 bed) house for aiding new releasees for up to one month and is relatively strict. The second provides less strict housing for residents who may stay up to six months. Third level residents may stay up to one year, possess their own house key, have flexible hours, however, no drugs or alcohol are permitted. Only ten Finnmarks (FIM) ($2.70) a day rent is paid by the client. The minimum wage is 1800 FIM ($486.00) a month but most clients make a minimum of 2500 FIM ($676.00) (Finnmarks divided by 3.7 for 1979 dollar equivalency.

The Criminal Welfare Association is now administratively located within the Ministry of Justice and functions under the Prison Administration. It has a board, to provide supervision, which is the highest decision making body for the Association. Seventy-seven percent of the money utilized by the Association comes from the national government, the remainder from the municipalities, and its own income from lodgers.

A conditional sentence and a probation sentence are both possible. For those offenders under 21 almost all crimes can be given conditional sentences if the legal sanction is under two years. Most of those between 15 and 21 receive some sort of supervised sentence. Adults do not receive supervision under this type of sentence.

The Association receives about 3000 cases per year for which it arranges supervision. Every commune (county) in Finland has a social welfare board which is elected. The larger cities (communes) have a permanent social office and child welfare office, which help to supervise and coordinate services for offenders, alcohol and drug-related abusers, etc. Of the 17 prisons and one mental hospital in Finland, all are overcrowded, hence the staff recognizes the need for greater utilization of community-based treatment and helping programs.

A Summary of Impressions

While the Ministry of Justice's Prison Administration maintains both open and closed institutions throughout Finland, administrators feel that the open institutions are among the best in Europe, due to such factors as full pay for the inmate population, light supervision, and good work projects as exemplified in Helsinki airfield reconstruction, roads, and restoration of historical buildings, etc. In fact, 1000 prisoners out of the 5000 in Finland are involved in the open institution programs. A general observation is that the staff of the Prison Administration feels that the Finnish prison system is the envy of the

other Scandinavian countries even though the Swedish and Danish systems have received more attention.

There is little problem in Finland with the abuse of "heavy" drugs other than those prescribed for medical purposes. Officials explained that the low level of the abuse of hard (illicit) drugs is probably related to Finland's geographic location--out of the mainline tourist and migrant worker patterns of visitation. A more serious and growing problem may be related to the high number of youth who abuse the use of alcohol. Migration of rural citizens to the urban centers during the past decade has also caused disruption of family lifestyles and close relationships. Finally, although unemployment is not a problem in the nation, the rapid acceleration of industrialization following World War II and the move from rural to urban lifestyles has caused social difficulties within the overall population. The various branches of Finnish government appear to be hard at work attempting to alleviate these problems through the development of sound social-justice policies.

Conclusion

Anttila concludes a discussion of corrections in Finland with the observation that Scandinavian cooperation has involved long and intensive discussion of reforms and the exchange of information. Nevertheless she notes that there has always been one country that acts as the forerunner, with the others following behind.

> Up to the 1960s Sweden had clearly been the leading country. During the early 1960s, Norway took over the leading position in some ideological respects. Finland, on its part, proceeded most rapidly in limiting the use of indeterminate incarceration (internment); the latest report of the Swedish State Crime Prevention Board, published at the end of 1977, adopts the so-called "neoclassical approach," thus clearly following the Finnish example as it has been documented during recent years. (Anttila, 1979:121).

Zagaris too concluded that there are ideas in the current criminal policy in Finland which can be adapted to other countries' penal systems.

> Two predominant criminal policy aims are to reduce societal expenditures for crime and to assure that the punishment and the crime are proportionate. After having gone through many changes, Finnish criminal policy once again emphasizes crime prevention and the role of punishment as a lesson to society to avoid antisocial acts. (Zagaris, 1977:32).

Joutsen has argued that "the general deterrence doctrine of Finland's modern criminal policy is based on the public perception of imprisonment as a severe sanction, suitable only for the more aggravated offenses." However, he recognizes that public perceptions may also slow down "the speed with which imprisonment can be replaced or shortened--or even humanized." Finally, he argues, "the key appears to lie in developing alternatives to imprisonment which the public can accept as true alternatives, and educating the public on the severe nature of deprivation of liberty." (Joutsen, 1979)

In America there is a similar recognition that past policies and practices have not been successful. The dis-

tinguished historian, Blake McKelvey, has written with great care and scholarship in tracing the evolution of American prisons from the intellectual and institutional antecedents of the new nation through the 1970s. He concludes:

> . . . the country's long hard experience with the tragedies of prisonization and with the failures, or at least the limitations, of corrections could not be brushed aside and forgotten. Proposals for the decriminalization of deviant behavior patterns not injurious to others, and for the development of restitution procedures as a means of enabling malefactors to win a respected place in the community by reimbursing their victims demonstrated the continued ingenuity of American society. Certainly, if experience demonstrated the need for more than a resurgence of good intentions, it also proved the folly of inaction and irresponsibility. The quest for order with justice demanded more, not less, dedication and participation. (McKelvey, 1977:383)

It is possible that no one nation has the ideal system of justice. It is possible that certain nations can be identified as making exemplary progress toward that ideal and that its progress can be monitored and measured for others to emulate. According to Anttila, the Penal Law Committee of Finland has stated that "it is the duty of society to constantly seek new alternatives to imprisonment and thus to minimize the use of prisons" (Anttila, 1979:107).

Does Finland have something to offer to interested Americans or to others beyond the region of northern Europe? To repeat, the answer must be in the affirmative.

References

Anttila, Inkeri. "Corrections in Finland" in International Corrections, Robert J. Wicks and H.H.A. Cooper (eds). Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath, 1979.

Clear, Val, and Scott Clear. "Some Other Issues" in Corrections: An Issues Approach. Schwartz, Martin D., Todd R. Clear, and Lawrence F. Travis III, (eds). Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing, 1980.

Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Look at Finland, Helsinki, January, 1977.

Flanagan, Timothy, M.J. Hindelang, and M.R. Gottfredson (eds) Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics-1979. U.S. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.

Gettinger, Steven. "U.S. Prison Population Hits All-Time High," Corrections Magazine, vol. 2, no. 3 (March, 1976).

Irwin, John. Prisons In Turmoil. Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown, 1980.

Johnson, Carolyn, and Marjorie Kravitz. Overcrowding in Correctional Institutions. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, 1978.

Joutsen, Matti. "The Role of Imprisonment in Finland." Helsinki: Research Institute of Legal Policy, 1980 (mimeograph).

Kittrie, Nicholas, and Jackwell Susman. Legality, Morality and Ethics in Criminal Justice. New York: Praeger, 1979.

McKelvey, Blake. American Prisons: A History of Good Intentions. Montclair, New Jersey: Patterson Smith, 1977.

Makinen, Tuija. "The Population of Closed Institutions." Helsinki: Research Institute of Legal Policy, publication no. 31, 1979.

Murton, Thomas O. The Dilemma of Prison Reform. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1976.

Nagel, William G. The New Red Barn: A Critical Look at the Modern American Prison. New York: Walker and Company, 1973.

_____. "On Behalf of a Moratorium on Prison Construction," Crime and Delinquency, April, 1977.

_____. "Prisonia: America's Growing Megalopolis," a paper presented at the Seminar for Legislators on Alternatives to New Prison Construction, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., September 18, 1979.

Newman, Donald J. "In Defense of Prisons" in Corrections: An Issues Approach. Schwartz, Martin D., Todd R. Clear, and Lawrence F. Travis III, (eds). Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing, 1980. The Newman article is a reprint from Psychiatric Annals, vol. 4 (March 1974).
See also: President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Task Force Report: Corrections. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967; and National Advisory Commission of Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. Corrections. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

Rutherford, Andrew et al. Prison Population and Policy Choices - Volume 1: Preliminary Report to Congress. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, 1978.

Sveri, Knut. "Forward" to Some Developments in Nordic Criminal Policy and Criminology. Stockholm: Scandinavian Research Council for Criminology, September, 1975.

Tornudd, Patrik. "Towards Crime Statistics Based on Damages" in Some Developments in Nordic Criminal Policy and Criminology. Stockholm: Scandinavian Research Council for Criminology, September, 1975.

_____. "Crime Trends in Finland 1950-1977." Helsinki: Research Institute of Legal Policy, publication no. 29, 1978.

Wilson, Rob. "U.S. Prison Population Again Hits New High," Corrections Magazine, vol. 3, no. 1 (March, 1977).

Zagaris, Bruce. Le Systeme Penal Finlandais - Reformes Recentes ("The Finnish Penal System - Recent Reforms"). Revue Penitentiare et de Droit Penal, Paris: Societe generale des prisons et de Legislation criminelle, v. lol, n. 4:573-603, October-December, 1977. Translated by Virginia Allison of Aspen Systems Corporation in International Summaries: A Collection of Selected Translations in Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Volume 2. U.S. Department of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.